

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated August 14, 2003, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by November 14, 2003.

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the abstract of the disclosure was objected to for informalities. Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,410,935 to Holston et al.

The Applicants note with appreciation the indicated allowability of claims 5-8 and 10, if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this amendment, claims 5-8 and 10 have been rewritten in independent form and to address the formal rejections under Section 112 as new claims 11-15, respectively. Claims 1-4 and 9 have been amended to address the rejections under Section 112, second paragraph.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-4 and 9 under Section 102, the Applicants respectfully disagree that the cited reference to Holston anticipates the present invention.

Holston shows and describes only a saw blade having teeth of equal tooth-width (teeth 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 12', and 14'), while in the present invention

as defined in the rejected claims, the saw blade has unequal groups of teeth with two different widths, a_2 and b_2 .

The Applicants respectfully submit that perhaps tooth-width and set-width or tooth height and tooth-width have been confused with one another in the Office Action. If teeth all have the same tooth width by a varying set width, each tooth that is the first to cut in a cutting process has to maintain the full load and take a chip out of the work piece in the entire width. If the teeth are smaller (that is, less wide), each tooth will remove smaller chips, having a smaller load to maintain. The smaller teeth have a higher wear resistance than the wider teeth, and thus less heat/less load. Indeed, the wear and load is distributed much better between the number of teeth and the saw blade is not as heavy and easier to be kept cool.

It has been held that anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir 1984). Moreover, for a prior art reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim with sufficient clarity to prove its existence in the prior art. *Motorola, Inc. v. Interdigital Tech. Corp.*, 43 USPQ 2d 1481, 1490 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

For these reasons, it is submitted that claims 1-4 and 9, as amended, define a patentably distinct set of features not disclosed by the reference to Holston et al. As such, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the

rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 and reconsideration of the claims as herein amended.

In light of the foregoing arguments in support of patentability, the Applicants respectfully submit that this application stands in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700